UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2446th MEETING: 26 MAY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2446) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);

Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2446th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 26 May 1983, at 4.00 p.m.

President: Mr. UMBA di LUTETE (Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2446)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
   Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Maudave (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2439th to 2444th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco. Mozambique, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Hadj Azzout (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Joseph (Australia), Mr. Hashim (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Adjibade (Benin), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Trucco (Chile), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Davin (Gabon), Mr. Blain (Gambia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mrs. Jones (Liberia), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Traore (Mali), Mr. Marin Bosch (Mexico), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Cabrera (Panama), Mr. Jamal

(Qatar), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Stevens (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Owiny (Uganda), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bassole (Upper Volta), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Czechoslovakia in which he requests to be invited to take part in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, pursuant to relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia) took a place at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to call the attention of members of the Council to document S/15792, which contains the text of a letter dated 26 May 1983 from the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States to the President of the Council. I intend to put the proposal contained in the letter to a vote at the next meeting of the Council devoted to consideration of this item.

7. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, Mr. Witness M. Mangwende. The Council welcomes him and I invite him to make his statement.

8. Mr. MANGWENDE (Zimbabwe): It is most appropriate, Sir, that these meetings of the Security Council on the question of Namibia is taking place under your stewardship. I congratulate you most warmly on your accession to the presidency and am confident that with your vast diplomatic experience and skill you will lead the Council towards its desired goal. Coming from Zaire, a valuable member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement, you are well acquainted with their preoccupation regarding the colonial question of Namibia.

9. As a member of the Council, Zimbabwe very warmly welcomes and appreciates the participation in this debate of ministers from many countries of the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement. Their presence augurs well for the outcome of our deliberations and eloquently demonstrates the unanimity of both the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement on the urgent need to end the illegal occupation of Namibia. We wish particularly to express our gratitude for the valuable contributions made to the debate by the following: Mr. Narasimha Rao, Minister for Foreign Affairs of India, the worthy representative of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement; and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, Mr. Moustapha Niasse, who presided over the recent successful International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983.

10. The Council is particularly honoured and its debate is enriched by the presence and participation of Comrade Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO. His statement at the 2439th meeting was certainly a major contribution to our search for a solution to the Namibian question.

11. The tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in the quest for a peaceful resolution of the Namibian problem are a matter of record. It is in this context that my delegation gratefully welcomes the report he has submitted to the Council [*S/15776*]. With his customary frankness, incisiveness and lucidity he has not only provided useful background information about the present impasse in our efforts to achieve Namibia's independence, but has also placed the convening of these meetings in its proper perspective.

12. With the indulgence of the Council, I shall, even at the risk of being boring, restate the real and only object of the present meetings as perceived by us in the front-line States. These meetings have been convened with the sole objective of securing the earliest implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) without any modifications or qualifications. We are, therefore, not here to provoke or court any unnecessary confrontation with any country or group of countries. Our commitment to the search for a speedy resolution of the Namibian question is a matter of public record; so also is our co-operation with the United Nations and with any country or group of countries joining in support of this cause. It is in this spirit, therefore, that we have in the past been engaged in serious consultations with the countries generally referred to as the Western contact group. And yet, very regrettably, no tangible progress has so far been achieved towards the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

13. As members of the Council know, it is now five years since, with so much fanfare, the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States presented to the Council a set of proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian colonial problem. The proposals led to the adoption by the Council of its well-known resolution 435 (1978), which has since been accepted by the entire international community as the realistic basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. The hard-working negotiators of the well-known United Nations plan had hoped for a settlement in 1978. Yet, because of South Africa's stalling tactics very little progress—if any—was achieved towards the implementation of the plan in the following two years.

14. However, as members of the Council will recall, during the last part of 1980, South Africa indicated through the Western contact group that it was then prepared to move towards the implementation of the plan if it could be convinced of the impartiality of the United Nations in

the supervision of the Namibian elections envisaged in that plan. In response to that, the United Nations convened a pre-implementation meeting in early 1981 at Geneva, with the following main objectives: to set a date for a cease-fire and to initiate the necessary process of implementing the United Nations plan as outlined in resolution 435 (1978).

15. It is, however, now an historical fact that the Geneva meeting collapsed without achieving any of its goals, because, although SWAPO had declared itself ready to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa at any time and anywhere, and was willing to co-operate with the United Nations in implementing the plan, South Africa did not share any of the objectives of that meeting. Instead, the South African delegation seized the opportunity to use the Geneva meeting as a propaganda forum to promote the so-called internal parties of Namibia. Although very disappointed, those of us who observed the Geneva meeting were hardly surprised at its outcome, which merely confirmed what had been said by the representatives of the Pretoria régime before and during the meeting.

16. Since the abortive 1981 meeting, the Pretoria régime has done nothing to suggest any willingness to co-operate with United Nations efforts to implement the United Nations Namibian plan. On the contrary, everything it says about its presence in Namibia and everything it is doing there clearly demonstrate a determination to maintain the illegal *status quo* in the Territory. Its arrogant contempt for the legitimate demands of the Namibians for freedom and independence and its flouting and open defiance of international opinion and law have increased markedly since 1981. Efforts by the United Nations to achieve Namibia's peaceful transition to freedom have gone unheeded while the situation in Namibia and in the whole of southern Africa has critically escalated during the period. Pretoria's illegal colonial occupation is maintained in Namibia by brutal force while a campaign of military aggression and intimidation as well as economic blackmail is vigourously pursued in order to destabilize the whole region.

17. The unrelieved oppression and repression of the Namibian and South African masses under ferocious *apartheid* domination, together with the raging undeclared war against front-line States and other majority-ruled States in the region, tell the ugly story of a region in a very dangerous conflict situation which threatens regional stability and international peace and security. That is the grim regional perspective within which the current meetings of the Council on the Namibian question are taking place.

18. This is also the grim context in which the raids by the régime's army and air force against Angola, Lesotho, Mozambique and Seychelles during the period under review should be understood. This too is the context within which Pretoria's use of subversive elements and mercenaries to violate the borders of neighbouring countries for the purpose of destroying vital economic infrastructures and abducting and assassinating refugees must be perceived. Similarly, this is the same criminal context in which South Africa's continued military occupation of southern Angola since July 1981 must be seen.

19. Last, but not least, the latest air raids against Mozambique, which my Government has already denounced in the strongest terms, also fall under the above rubric. Like those committed on previous occasions against Mozambique and other countries of the region, the raids of 23 May were absolutely unprovoked. It is not surprising, therefore, that they have been roundly and widely condemned and denounced by all civilized mankind.

20. I have already said that the present debate has been necessitated by the urgent and pressing need to obtain South Africa's co-operation in efforts to implement resolution 435 (1978) so that the people of Namibia, who have suffered greatly and continue to suffer under colonial occupation, may achieve their freedom and independence without further delay. Eleven months ago this goal seemed to be only one leap away. In fact, there was so much optimism in the air that the March 1983 Namibian elections under United Nations supervision seemed to be a real possibility.

21. I refer here to the momentum generated by consultations between, on the one hand, the Western contact group and, on the other, the front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO from around mid-1981, culminating in the more informal but intensive meetings here in New York in July and August 1982 between the representatives of these groups. As the report of the Secretary-General righly points out, the representatives were so satisfied with the progress made that they jointly confirmed to him that all relevant issues pertaining to the implementation of the United Nations plan had been raised and addressed to their mutual satisfaction and especially to the satisfaction of both South Africa and SWAPO. Useful consultations were also held with the Secretary-General and his senior colleagues and experts in preparation for the implementation of the United Nations plan, possibly by March 1983.

22. Regrettably, however, just as the front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO were planning to request the convening of a Council meeting to adopt a short resolution to set in motion the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), it became clear that, as the report of the Secretary-General says, other issues which were outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) and which had not been raised or envisaged in earlier consultations were becoming a stumbling-block in the negotiations on Namibia. The United States, a member of the contact group, and South Africa publicly and clearly said that resolution 435 (1978) could not be implemented until the Cuban forces stationed in Angola since 1975 were withdrawn from that country.

23. The front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO, which had up to now co-operated in good faith with the contact group in efforts to address all issues pertaining to resolution 435 (1978), unequivocally rejected any attempt to

link the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola to the process of Namibian decolonization. They insisted instead that the United Nations plan as approved in resolution 435 (1978) was limited to the Namibian colonial question and was therefore never intended to be a comprehensive cure for the problems of the whole southern African region, much less to be used for the promotion and protection of the global economic, geopolitical and strategic interests of any super-Power. We still stand very firmly by this interpretation of the plan and reject any linkage or parallelism as naked interference in the affairs of sovereign States. We would further wish to remind those insisting on linkage that they should instead bring pressure to bear upon Pretoria to withdraw its forces from southern Angola, which it has been occupying, in defiance of the Council's demands and resolutions, since July 1981. Is this silence on their part tacit encouragement to South Africa in its glaring violation of international law?

24. It is the withdrawal of occupationist South African troops from Angola that we should be talking about here. Yet nothing is being said about this by those who would like us to believe that they are honest brokers in the Namibian saga. Instead we are being urged to violate long-established norms of international relations by dwelling on a matter that is properly the sovereign responsibility of two members of the Organization—Angola and Cuba. The Cuban internationalist forces are in Angola as a result of a free, sovereign decision by both Angola and Cuba. South African troops are occupationist forces. It is therefore the withdrawal of those occupationist forces that should rightly exercise the minds of all peace-loving members of the international community, because the presence of South African troops in southern Angola is now the major obstacle to peace in the region. For how can we accept the violation of the territorial integrity of a State Member of this Organization as normal in international relations? How can we allow the racist aggressor—South Africa—to dictate terms to the victims of aggression? South African troops should withdraw from Angola at once.

25. The members of the contact group have told the Council that they are still committed to the achievement of Namibia's independence and that they are extending an invitation to us to co-operate with them, as we have done in the past. For our part, this invitation is hardly necessary. We must warn, however, that co-operation with them is conditional upon a common understanding of the real issue regarding Namibia. For us, the real and only issue is the denial to the people of Namibia of their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence by the illegal occupation régime of South Africa.

26. Similarly, co-operation with the contact group must be based on a common desire to achieve implementation of the United Nations plan in resolution 435 (1978), without modification, qualification or prevarication.

27. We have come to the Council because the five-year-old United Nations plan on Namibia remains unimplemented owing to South Africa's intransigence and prevarication. We should therefore like the Council to reaffirm the United Nations legal authority over Namibia and its own primary responsibility for ensuring the immediate implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We should also like the Council to mandate the Secretary-General to initiate consultations with parties to the proposed cease-fire to facilitate the earliest implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

28. We also believe that even at this late hour South Africa has an opportunity to, and still can, reconsider its present position and thus facilitate the international drive to achieve a peaceful settlement in Namibia. Accordingly, the proposed draft resolution calls upon the Government of South Africa to make a firm commitment as to its readiness to comply with resolution 435 (1978). Pretoria is also being called upon to co-operate forthwith and fully with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in the interest of the early independence of Namibia.

29. This is perhaps the appropriate time to make a slight but pertinent digression. In the course of a valuable contribution to this debate on 23 May [*2439th meeting*], the representative of the United Kingdom said that South Africa co-operated and assisted in the implementation of the Lancaster House settlement of the Southern Rhodesian question. Indeed, members of the Council must have been, as we were, very surprised to hear the spokesman of the *apartheid* régime accept credit for this without any sign of embarrassment.

30. Is it conceivable that after over a decade of arrogantly violating and defying international law with respect to the illegal Smith régime in Rhodesia, the *apartheid* rulers of Pretoria suddenly had a change of heart when the Lancaster House agreement was concluded? Is it logical that they would have co-operated with the Government of Zimbabwe when for five years they had been doing everything possible to undermine the Governments of Angola and Mozambique? Why would South Africa suddenly co-operate in 1980? This assertion of co-operation and assistance is certainly not borne out by Zimbabwe's experience during and after the implementation of the Lancaster House settlement. On the contrary, South Africa declared itself to be the No. 1 enemy of peace, reconciliation, development and prosperity in our country right from the beginning and continues to do so now. I am referring here to the same régime that, on the eve of our independence, recruited over 5,000 counter-revolutionaries and criminals to be trained and equipped and infiltrated back into our country to commit acts of sabotage against our economic infrastructure and all sorts of crimes against the peace-loving people of Zimbabwe.

31. South Africa has yet to prove and demonstrate its co-operation, not only with Zimbabwe but with countries of the whole region.

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs

of Yugoslavia, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): The fact that you, Sir, are presiding over this exceptionally important meeting of the Council is very encouraging. As the representative of Zaire, you represent the positions of the African Group of countries, whose unity and resolve in supporting the liberation struggle of the Namibian people are well known. As a representative of a country in the south of Africa, you are fully aware of the seriousness of the situation in and around Namibia. Finally, your diplomatic skill and experience will contribute significantly to the successful consideration of the Namibian problem in the Council at the present time.

34. The non-aligned countries have been and continue to be the broadest and firmest stronghold of the struggle for independence of all colonial peoples, including the people of Namibia. As the Council knows, I am attending this meeting, like a number of other ministers for foreign affairs of non-aligned countries, in accordance with the decision taken at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983. The Heads of State or Government called on the Council to meet as soon as possible to consider further action to be taken in order to bring about the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, and to assume its primary responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). They reaffirmed the solidarity of the non-aligned countries with the Namibian people, and their support for their heroic struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. [*See S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I, paras. 40-51.*]

35. The seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries once again resolutely confirmed the position shared by almost all members of the international community that the illegal occupation of Namibia must finally come to an end. It proceeded from the assessment that the region of southern Africa is the hotbed of an international crisis with global implications. The persistence of the South African racist régime in refusing to comply with the decisions of the United Nations should therefore meet with the most resolute response and the co-ordinated action of the international community aimed at the urgent implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

36. The question of Namibia is not only an African problem but a global problem as well, involving as it does the basic principles on which international relations are founded. Foreign domination in Namibia, as anywhere else, poses a direct threat to international peace and security. Therefore, resistance to foreign domination in Namibia and elsewhere is a pre-condition for safeguarding peace and security. The South African racist régime, by its very existence, threatens the security of Africa and beyond, especially the adjacent regions of the Indian Ocean and the south Atlantic.

37. The fact that South Africa has been occupying Namibia for 17 years since the United Nations ended its Mandate [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*] and that it has ignored all the decisions adopted by the United Nations over those years can no longer be tolerated. This cannot and should not be tolerated, for, if it were, it would mean further violation of the right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence and the continuation of their suffering. Instead of being able to exercise their right to self-determination, the Namibian people have for many years known only occupation, *apartheid*, terror and exploitation by the South African régime. The ruthless exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by South Africa and by transnational corporations, in spite of the relevant United Nations resolutions and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia,[1] constitutes a brutal violation of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to dispose freely of their natural, social and economic potentials.

38. Today, in the ninth decade of the twentieth century, the existence of colonial exploitation despite the opposition and condemnation of the international community is an historical anachronism. Every further day, week or month of occupation brings new victims and further suffering to the Namibian people struggling for freedom under the leadership of their liberation movement, SWAPO. It is from the United Nations, from this body, from all of us here, that the Namibian people expect help. How much longer will the people of Namibia have to suffer and make sacrifices for their freedom?

39. This situation should no longer be tolerated, for it also poses a danger to world peace and security. The illegal occupying régime has been massing its troops in Namibia as well as forcibly mobilizing the Namibian population and recruiting mercenaries. The Territory of Namibia has become a springboard for continued acts of aggression against the neighbouring front-line States, particularly Angola, taking a heavy toll of human lives and causing enormous destruction. The savage air raid on Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, is the latest expression of South Africa's policy of destabilization of sovereign and independent neighbouring countries—and that aggressive act was carried out on the very eve of the convening of the Council, representing a new challenge to the United Nations. All this is turning southern Africa into a permanent and dangerous hotbed of crisis. The continuation of the occupation and of the acts of aggression against both Namibia and the front-line States carries with it the danger of further interference by non-regional factors and of changing the character of the Namibian problem, which is a colonial issue. This leads to the question of Namibia being drawn into block rivalry and confrontation, making the process of the acquisition of independence by Namibia conditional upon the relations between the blocs.

40. Finally, the failure to resolve the problem of Namibia has manifold adverse effects on the prestige and

role of the United Nations. In the course of its almost 40 years of existence, the world Organization has many times faced the fact that it is impossible to undertake effective action and achieve results in dealing with questions on which groups of Member States maintain diametrically opposed positions. The problem of Namibia, however, is a matter in regard to which there exists the broadest concurrence of all Member States, with the sole exception of the occupying régime of South Africa. This was evident when the Council five years ago adopted resolution 435 (1978) approving the United Nations plan for Namibia. All countries point out that they are in favour of Namibia's independence and of the implementation of the United Nations plan. It is essential for the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations, therefore, that all countries that support the strengthening of its role commit themselves most resolutely to the urgent solution of at least those problems in regard to which there are both the concurrence of all Member States and agreement on ways and means of solving them. The problem of Namibia certainly belongs to this category. In resolving this problem, particular responsibility is borne by the permanent members of the Council that are members of the contact group, whose countries maintain relations with South Africa and therefore can have an influence on it.

41. The United Nations plan approved in Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which were adopted unanimously, is already five years old. The hopes it raised with respect to a possible solution have not been fulfilled to this date. For four years the tactics of the South African racists were to undermine all consultations on the implementation of the plan, on the most transparent pretexts. Last year, however, there seemed to be a change. It appeared that the contact group of five Western countries had finally acted in accordance with its responsibility and decided to pressure South Africa into implementing the plan. During consultations conducted last summer almost all the practical problems were finally settled. Aside from some technical problems with regard to the composition of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), it only remained for South Africa to decide which of the two methods of election it was going to accept. The way to the implementation of the plan seemed thus to be wide open, and the Secretariat began extensive preparations so as not to be overtaken by the seemingly rapid developments.

42. However, a sudden insistence on linking the implementation of the United Nations plan to the presence of foreign troops in independent Angola marked the beginning of the latest stalemate in the attempts to solve the Namibian problem, a stalemate which still continues and because of which we are gathered here. With the object of continuing the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime in Pretoria and the plundering of its natural resources, new difficulties are created, making Namibia's independence conditional on entirely irrelevant matters.

43. My country's position—which we share with almost all other countries—is that the process of granting independence to Namibia cannot and should not be made conditional on anything, except on compliance with the provisions of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The question of the presence of foreign troops in Angola is a matter which should be considered and decided only by independent Angola. This question has never had anything to do with Namibia, even at the time of the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Therefore, the linking of the two cannot be interpreted in any other way than as an obstruction of the plan.

44. It is high time for the United Nations to take decisive action aimed at carrying out its direct responsibility for Namibia. This is a problem of colonialism and it should be solved within the framework of the United Nations, like all other similar problems. The Council, which has adopted the relevant resolutions, has a central role in this respect and it should not allow them to become a dead letter. The process of moving towards independence should finally be started. This time, however, we cannot confine ourselves merely to supporting the implementation of the United Nations plan. The Council should demonstrate its resolve and seriousness, befitting the role entrusted to it by the Charter, and set the time-frame for the implementation of the plan. During that time the Council should closely follow the problem in order to be able to intervene promptly and to remove any possible obstacles that might get in the way. However, in resolving the question of Namibia's independence, other channels should not be excluded, provided that they are under the responsibility of the United Nations.

45. We see the role of the contact group exclusively within that framework and as an instrument of the implementation of the United Nations plan. Its responsibility is to use its capacity to influence South Africa so as to make it comply with resolution 435 (1978). The international community rightly expects this from the contact group, and any different activity by the group or by any of its members or any attempt to take the question of Namibia's independence out of the competence of the United Nations is unacceptable.

46. If the action on the part of the Council fails to break the present deadlock, my country will, as it has done in the past, support any measure aimed at exerting pressure on South Africa, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. We believe that all countries should apply measures of economic boycott to South Africa on the basis of the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

47. It is also the duty of all Member States to lend their support to the actions taken by the United Nations Council for Namibia. For a number of years, that body—now under the able presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia—has been the initiator of most of the actions aimed at assisting the struggle of the people of Namibia and at attaining independence for Namibia. The recent International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, sponsored by the United Nations, adopted the Paris Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action on Namibia.[2]

These documents contain important recommendations for assistance to the struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, as well as for assistance to the front-line States. My country fully supports those recommendations.

48. For its part, Yugoslavia will continue to support the struggle of the Namibian people as long as that struggle is necessary and until the people of Namibia are able to decide their own future through free and fair elections held under the auspices of the United Nations. My country considers support for that struggle an obligation emanating from our own past and from the ideals and principles that emerged in our own struggle for freedom.

49. These meetings of the Council are a test of the United Nations determination finally to start the process of the independence of Namibia and not to allow any further delays, excuses or actions incompatible with that goal. It is the duty of the Council not to permit the continuation of acts of aggression and threats to international peace and security in southern Africa. The solution of the question of Namibia's independence would greatly contribute to the general relaxation of tension and to the stability of international relations. The expectations of the international community must not be betrayed this time. We hope that the Council will act in conformity with its responsibilities and the powers vested in it.

50. In this context we believe that the role of the Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations plan should be reaffirmed. We are confident that his understanding of the problem and his dedication to the independence of Namibia will significantly contribute to the much-needed active role of the United Nations in the forthcoming period.

51. All statements regarding the right of peoples and countries to live in freedom will remain void of any meaning unless they are implemented in Namibia as well. The United Nations and the entire international community are faced with this historic responsibility.

52. Having ended my statement, I should now like to add a few words on a personal note.

53. I have had the privilege today of addressing this meeting of this most important body of the United Nations after long years of absence from this historic chamber of the Security Council where, in the past decade, I witnessed many important developments relating to the maintenance of peace and security in the world and to securing the liberation, independence and peace of peoples and nations that asked this body to take immediate action on the basis of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

54. To be here again fills me with emotion, memories and reminiscences of the work of the Security Council in the past. As an observer, a participant in the debates, a member of the Council and as its President during many crucial trials, I was able to hear in this room sometimes excellent oratory, sometimes futile debate, but I also witnessed and participated in many actions leading to the preservation of peace and the strengthening of the independence and territorial integrity and sovereignty of some States Members of the United Nations, or helping oppressed people gain their liberation and freedom. The symbolic mural in this room is a reminder of this historic role of the United Nations and its main organ, the Security Council.

55. In recent years, however, frustration, futility, despair and impotence regarding the taking of action in the same direction have prevailed more and more in this room where, during the history of the work of the United Nations, we have witnessed so many bold actions in pursuit of the aims of the Charter. When, in 1978, we witnessed the unanimous adoption here of resolution 435 (1978), we were all elated to think that the year 1978 would be the year of the independence of Namibia after so many protracted efforts to achieve it. After the adoption of that resolution, during the ninth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the problem of Namibia—which I was privileged to preside over—in intensive private consultations that were proceeding concurrently with the general debate, a timetable and a calendar of immediate steps for the achievement of the freedom and independence of Namibia were already drawn up.

56. This was in 1978, during the months of April and May. But again, everything was sabotaged, delayed, protracted, mixed with other unrelated matters, and so far the whole effort has failed. If there is a case in which the Council should reassert its authority, if there is an opportunity for the United Nations to play again the positive role in finalizing the inevitable, historic, global process of decolonization and emancipation of all the peoples in the world, it is the case of the independence of Namibia, a case so clear-cut, so unequivocally justified, so universally accepted that it can be solved very promptly if the political willingness to do so prevails in this body.

57. If we failed to make 1978 the year of the independence of Namibia, the Council can succeed now, with our universal support, in making 1983 the year of the proclamation of the independence of Namibia, thus not only fulfilling an old dream of the United Nations but also ensuring the freedom, peace and independence of the tortured people of Namibia, who have suffered for so long, and preserving thereby the peace and security of the whole continent of Africa, which should finally be rid of colonialism and racist subjugation, in the interest of humanity, justice and the further progress of all the nations of the world.

58. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Qatar, who wishes to make a statement as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations for the month of May. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

59. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, may I at the outset thank you and the other members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate on behalf of the Group of Arab States in the present important debate.

60. In his report [*S/15776*], the Secretary-General expressed his deep concern at the fact that, despite the passage of five years since the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), it had yet to be implemented, and he asserted that the political situation in the region had deteriorated. It was expected that, in accordance with that resolution, which endorsed the United Nations plan, independence would be achieved by Namibia during 1978—that is, after the fulfilment of certain legislative and political requirements agreed to by all the parties concerned at an early stage, and especially by SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the Namibian people. The Council welcomed the declared readiness of SWAPO to co-operate in implementing the resolution and to sign the cease-fire agreement and comply with it. But, from the beginning, the racist Government of Pretoria resorted to prevarication and raised a series of obstacles one after the other to prevent the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It used the negotiations as a strategem to mislead world public opinion, to buy time to tighten its grip on Namibia and, at the same time, to enable the transnationals to plunder and deplete Namibia's natural resources.

61. The persistence of the racist Pretoria régime in its illegal occupation of Namibia and in depriving the Namibian people of the right to self-determination, independence and freedom, under the terms of resolution 435 (1978), constituted flagrant defiance of the Council and the United Nations, which bears a special legal and ethical responsibility to rescue Namibia from the grip of the white minority racist Government of South Africa. That is a fact which the United Nations, we believe, does not deny. In concluding his report, the Secretary-General reaffirmed that he regarded the problem of Namibia as a special responsibility of the Secretary-General in view of the unique relationship between the United Nations and the people of Namibia.

62. While commending the Secretary-General for his efforts to discharge this responsibility, we must insist on the importance and seriousness of the time factor, especially since one of the parties, the Pretoria régime, which represents the illegal occupation authority, abuses this factor on the pretext of the negotiations of the contact group, which for the past five years has been going round in a vicious circle, the ingenuity of imperialism always discovering a new pretext completely extraneous to the central issue of the occupation of Namibia. The negotiations, which until then had been the only means of ensuring the implementation of resolution resolution 435 (1978), have reached an impasse.

63. An examination of the statements of the great majority of representatives in the Council sheds light on a fact on which there is unanimity among the countries of the third world, most of which belong to the Non-Aligned Movement, that is, that the States members of the contact group—or, to be more precise, some of them—have derailed the negotiations with the racist Pretoria régime and arrogated to themselves the right to inject a new extraneous element into the issue under negotiation: the linkage of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola.

64. It is no secret that this arbitrary linkage, adopted specifically by the United States Administration, is designed to serve American national interests and also represents another dimension of the East-West confrontation.

65. I therefore affirm, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, that the problem of Namibia has nothing whatsoever to do with cold-war manoeuvres, and that it is a grave injustice to manipulate the destiny of the Namibian people and perpetuate their sufferings under racist repression and inhuman oppression, and to prolong the denial of their most elementary human rights just to score a point in the rivalry between the super-Powers for spheres of influence. It is as though the destinies of people who are still, on the threshhold of the twenty-first century, groaning under the yoke of occupation, count for nothing in the plans of those States which still insist on linking the independence of Namibia with the abdication, by yet another independent African States, of a sovereign right. And all this so that the United States can score a point in the East-West confrontation at the expense not only of the sovereignty of Angola but also of the future of the Namibian people and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

66. The only way to extricate the question of Namibia from the impasse in which it has been placed by the contact group, is for the initiative concerning talks on this matter to be passed back to the United Nations, especially to the Council, as provided for in resolution 435 (1978). Holding the talks within a United Nations framework would protect them from being diverted from their purpose by extraneous issues that serve only the national interests of a super-Power that is not one of the parties to the conflict. Accordingly, the Group of Arab States reaffirms that resolution 435 (1978) remains the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. The Group therefore rejects the efforts made by some States members of the contact group which have not yet dissociated themselves from the principle of linking the independence of Namibia with other extraneous issues, especially the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola. In addition to the fact that such linkage steers the talks away from the right direction and does not further the objectives of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the introduction of this extraneous element gives the racist régime of Pretoria an opportunity to consolidate its occupation by continuously threatening the neighbouring African States, in particular Angola, so as to keep them permanently preoccupied with the protection of their security, and thus perpetuates the pretext of linkage indefinitely. I do not think that the international

community has already forgotten the military campaigns waged by South Africa against the front-line African States, including attempts to invade Angola and the latest brutal raid against Mozambique.

67. We therefore support the recommendations of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April,[2] with the participation of 136 States. We especially support the rejection of any attempt to link Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola and call on members of the contact group to follow the example of France, one of the members of that group and dissociate themselves from the idea of linkage since such an attempt, in addition to impeding the decolonization of Namibia, constitutes flagrant interference in the internal affairs of an independent State Member of the United Nations.

68. We also call upon the Council to adopt the necessary measures to implement its resolution 418 (1977) by securing the commitment of all Member States to observe the arms embargo against South Africa.

69. We therefore support the call of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of India, who spoke to the Council on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement [*2439th meeting*], to establish a time-frame for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and for the Council to remain actively seized of this problem until that process is accomplished.

70. However, if the South African Government persists in its defiance of the resolutions of the Council and in refusing to honour its commitments in accordance with the Charter, the Council has no option but to exercise its responsibility, invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations impose sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria to make it acquiesce in the will of the international community and put an end to its illegal occupation of all the Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the islands that are an integral part of the occupied Territory of South West Africa and to declare its annexation by South Africa null and void.

71. In conclusion, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, for which I speak, I reaffirm our support for Namibia's just demands, endorsed in Council resolution 435 (1978), and our unreserved and total solidarity with the Namibian people in their struggle to liberate their land and achieve their independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative.

72. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

73. Mr. KURODA (Japan): First of all, I should like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to participate in the discussion of the question of Namibia, one of the most important and long-standing matters ever to come before the United Nations.

74. Japan is not a member of the Security Council at this time but, because it is so deeply concerned not only about Namibia but also about the situation throughout the region, my delegation feels in duty bound to speak out on this question.

75. Before doing so, I wish to comment on the recent violence in Pretoria and South Africa's retaliatory raid into Mozambique on 23 May last. Japan abhors these acts of violence and deeply regrets the suffering and loss of life. Such acts of reciprocal violence can only lead to a deterioration of the situation throughout southern Africa and retard still further efforts towards a solution of the many problems there. Those unfortunate events, though not directly related, make the Council's consideration of the question of Namibia especially timely and appropriate. It will provide an opportunity to review the situation and, what is more, to build up new momentum in the efforts to achieve an independent Namibia and, it is hoped, bring a degree of stability to that gravely troubled region.

76. During the two years since the Council last took up this question [*2267th to 2277th meetings*], strenuous efforts to bring about a solution have been made by the international community. My delegation heartily commends the efforts of SWAPO, the OAU, the contact group, the front-line States and Nigeria, as well as the good offices of the Secretary-General.

77. I should like particularly to express my delegation's deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his further report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia [*S/15776*]. That report, which has my delegation's full support, contains a well-balanced presentation of the conflicting interests and should serve as a useful basis for the current deliberations.

78. The Secretary-General notes that, during the two-year period covered by the report, progress has been made in a number of ways. For example, principles concerning the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution for an independent Namibia have been accepted by the parties concerned. He also reports that substantial progress has been made on the question of United Nations impartiality and on the size, composition and arrangements for deploying the military component of UNTAG.

79. Despite these positive developments, a peaceful, just and internationally acceptable settlement is not yet in sight. The undeniable progress that has been made in the negotiations of the past two years has not been uninterrupted: there have also been setbacks, and this serves to remind us that the issues involved are extraordinarily complex and the gaps yet to be bridged substantial.

80. It is widely recognized that South Africa's intransigence has hampered the process of negotiation and is thus a major obstacle to the complete resolution of the Namibian problem. On the other hand, it should be noted with concern that there are other factors, of which

we are all aware, that stand in the way of an early solution. In view of the complexity of the problem, we must recognize that only patience and mutual trust will produce concrete results.

81. My delegation fervently hopes that the talks among the parties concerned, particularly the contact group members, the front-line States, SWAPO and South Africa, will lead to the successful resolution of the problem, thereby paving the way for the independence of Namibia.

82. Japan appeals once again to South Africa to respond to the voice of this world body and extend its full and sincere co-operation to the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Failure to do so will merely postpone a settlement and result in additional needless suffering and hardship throughout the region.

83. In the meantime, we must not forget the tragic plight of the Namibian people, as well as that of others whose lives are affected by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and by the ensuing armed struggles taking place both in Namibia and in southern Angola. Japan will continue to join the rest of the international community in efforts to alleviate the human suffering there and provide the Namibian people with the assistance necessary to enable them to overcome the present difficulties and prepare for the independence of their country.

84. Looking to the future, the Government of Japan reaffirms its commitment to extend positive support in various forms to the operation of UNTAG once it is established and, following the achievement of independence, Japan will make every possible effort to extend its co-operation to the people of Namibia throughout the nation-building period.

85. I should like to end my remarks by joining with the Secretary-General in calling

> "urgently on all concerned to strengthen and concert their efforts within the framework of the United Nations and to demonstrate the necessary political will to bring about the early independence of Namibia . . . as the essential and primary issue, which we must now face up to without further delay". [*ibid., para. 20.*]

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Sri Lanka. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

87. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Sir, may I at the outset extend to you my delegation's congratulations and good wishes on your assumption of the duties of President of the Council during the month of May. It was also particularly heartening to see the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, a friend and not so long ago a colleague, who now holds high office in your country, presiding over the proceedings of the Council during these most important deliberations on Namibia.

88. I also wish to express our appreciation of the work of your predecessor, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, who presided over the Council during the month of April.

89. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka was among the ministers designated by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March at New Delhi, to participate in this series of meetings of the Council on the question of Namibia. The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. A. C. S. Hameed, has asked me to convey his sincere regret that urgent duties requiring his presence in Sri Lanka have precluded his personal attendance at this meeting of the Council.

90. You, Mr. President, and the members of the Council have already heard a number of ministers and leaders of delegations speaking on the question of Namibia, of which the Council is now seized. The history of the question of Namibia, South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the involvement and responsibilities of the United Nations, the long struggle and the acknowledged leadership of SWAPO, the heroism of its fighting men and the patient perseverance of the front-line States require no repetition; nor does one need to say who stands in the way of a peaceful solution of the question. The representative of South Africa, in a characteristic display, told the Council only two days ago [*2440th meeting*] of his Government's terms, which sounded more like an ultimatum. Suffice it to say that, apart from that show of defiance, he did not say much that was wholly new.

91. The Secretary-General's further report concerning the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia is a restrained and accurate account of events since the Council last considered this question. Even the representative of South Africa, whose Government has invariably complained of bias on the part of the Organization—not to speak of the international community as a whole—grudgingly acknowledged at the 2440th meeting what he described as the more constructive tone of that report. Resolution 435 (1978), which is the basis for a Namibia settlement, was, he said, accepted for implementation by South Africa as far back as December 1978.

92. Therefore, resolution 435 (1978) is where we are; and, as for its acceptance by all, there is no dispute. After its adoption by the Council in 1978, the work of its implementation was assumed by the Western contact group, whose members were, for all purposes, the authors of that resolution. It is furthest from my delegation's wish to discount or deny the efforts that the Western contact group has invested in this task. Yet, it is no secret that, time and again, it was itself thwarted in its efforts by the obduracy of the Government in Pretoria, whose policies within its own territory, in Namibia and towards its neighbours remain irreconcilable with what passes elsewhere for ordinary common sense and human decency. I refer in particular to the South African Government's policy of *apartheid* which, in this, the twentieth century, holds over 80 per cent of its population in bondage, and

that only because of the colour of its skin. The security which South Africa demands from its neighbours and from the international community is essentially security for the perpetuation of that inhuman system. But we have not come here to discuss that issue.

93. It is common knowledge that the South African Government caused the collapse of the pre-implementation talks at Geneva in January 1981. Apart from other devices for procrastination, that was followed by the South African Government's new line, long mentioned only in the corridors but now openly proclaimed. That line is that Namibia's independence is unquestionably linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. That was an issue which was not raised when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted by the Council and accepted by South Africa, and it has been acknowledged by some members of the Western contact group to be irrelevant to the question of Namibia, which is one of decolonization. The Secretary-General's report, restrained as it is, tells us of this new situation.

94. It is almost five years since resolution 435 (1978) was adopted and over two years since the events which took place at Geneva, after which the Western contact group made renewed efforts to prevail upon an intransigent Government in South Africa. Implementation of resolution 435 (1978) was and remains the responsibility of the United Nations. The time has come for the United Nations to resume that responsibility. In so doing, the United Nations and the Secretary-General will have every opportunity at their full discretion to consult with and seek the co-operation of all the parties which have so far been involved; and that includes the Government of South Africa, SWAPO, the Western contact group and the front-line States. We should like to think that that co-operation with the Secretary-General will be no less forthcoming.

95. Parallels have been drawn between Namibia and the protracted process which brought about the independence of Zimbabwe. The need for caution has been expressed, and threats have been issued about the futility of setting deadlines. Again, while not discounting the worth of the protracted efforts that brought about the independence of Zimbabwe, we know that, throughout, Zimbabwe was kept outside the United Nations forum, which is not the case of Namibia. On the subject of deadlines, the Secretary-General cannot be asked to function in a vacuum. It is normal and customary for him to report back to the Council, and to seek a report by a specified date is no ultimatum or deadline. After the adoption in 1978 of resolution 435 (1978), the Council in its wisdom set no deadlines for a solution, but it did indeed receive reports. The Council knows best whether it will need to have recourse to other measures in the Charter of the United Nations to enforce its own resolutions.

96. To my delegation, this meeting seems an appropriate opportunity to recall the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization, submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session,[3] in which he focused with sincerity and remarkable frankness on the crisis facing the Organization. The observations of the Secretary-General could not apply with greater relevance to any other issue challenging the world community today. The question of Namibia presents an opportunity for the Council—and, may I add, for the members of the Western contact group—to discharge the special responsibility they have assumed to demonstrate their commitment and to reaffirm the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a pleasure for me at the outset, Sir, to welcome your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council at this critical phase of the question of Namibia. Through you, the delegation of Egypt salutes fraternal Zaire, which you represent here with your well-known ability and experience. We are confident that your experience and qualities will contribute to the achievement of the success we all desire in the Council's consideration of the issue it is discussing today.

99. The delegation of Egypt is pleased also to welcome Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Through Mr. Nujoma we pay a tribute to the militant people of Namibia and renew our pledge that Egypt—in whose capital, Cairo, the first office of SWAPO was situated—will remain at their side in the face of constant aggression by the racist régime of South Africa, and will do so until the Namibian people achieve their inalienable rights of self-determination, sovereignty and independence.

100. I should like to read out to the Council the following message from Mr. Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt. The text of his letter is as follows:

> "Egypt reaffirms its firm resolve to continue its support for the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate and authentic representative. Egypt supports every sincere effort by the international community represented in the United Nations that is aimed at enabling the struggling people of Namibia to shake off the yoke of colonialism and regain its full and legitimate rights to freedom, sovereignty and independence."

101. Council resolution 435 (1978), which was unanimously adopted, contained the framework for a just settlement leading to the independence of Namibia. The delegation of Egypt, together with other delegations, therefore feels justified in calling upon the Council at this time to take the action necessary for implementing that resolution fully, without any qualifications or modifications. The United Nations has a special responsibility for the question of Namibia, one that dates back to its earliest

meetings some 37 years ago, when it discussed for the first time ways to prevent the racist Government of South Africa from implementing its scheme to annex that Territory.

102. Egypt unequivocally condemns and categorically rejects the racist policy of South Africa in Namibia and adopts the same position with regard to any support or assistance given to that racist régime, which necessarily leads to the consolidation of South Africa's occupation of Namibia and to its persistence in its racist and colonialist policy against the people of Namibia and the people of South Africa. From the very beginning, South Africa has adopted a position contrary to the will of the international community with regard to Namibia, a will unanimously embodied in the efforts and resolutions of the United Nations. The racist Pretoria régime has not only ignored the resolutions of the international Organization; it has also frustrated the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and has prevented it from carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to it by the United Nations. It has persisted in its schemes to control the Territory of Namibia and deplete its natural resources.

103. Five years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and the beginning of the efforts by the members of the Western contact group, we have seen no progress that augurs well for the independence of the Namibian people. On the contrary, we have seen a clear deterioration in the situation, not only in Namibia, where the Government of Pretoria has sought to tighten its grip on the occupied Territory by various means, but also outside Namibia, where it is engaging in armed aggression against African front-line States and occupying some of their territories in a calculated effort to provoke disturbances and destabilization.

104. The problem of Namibia was given special priority at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March of this year, because of the concern created by Pretoria's persistence in occupying the Territory, in violation of the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions, and because of the importance the Non-Aligned Movement attaches to the deplorable situation that has resulted from the fact that that régime continues to oppress the people of Namibia and to commit aggression against neighbouring African States, thereby creating a threat to international peace and security.

105. The final document of the Conference [*S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I*] reflected the firm position of the countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement in a clear and lucid manner. I need not dwell upon the contents of that comprehensive document, which refers to the importance of a renewed commitment on the part of the international community to stand firmly against the racist and colonialist policy of South Africa, including the imposition of mandatory sanctions against that régime, and calls for the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), in both the letter and spirit, without any modification or qualification. Resolution 345 (1978) remains the only basis for achieving a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, and the struggle being waged by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the military wing of SWAPO, to free the country from colonialism and occupation is just and legitimate.

106. The statement [*2439th meeting*] by Mr. Sam Nujoma, the leader of SWAPO, the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, to the Council was categorical and clear. In it, he called upon the United Nations to shoulder its responsibilities, in view of the failure of the attempts so far to attain its stated objective, namely, to enable the Namibian people to establish an independent State in their own territory, a State based on justice, liberty and equality. There can be no doubt that the delay in reaching a peaceful settlement and the lack of any real progress towards that settlement obliges us to reaffirm the importance of the time factor in every international problem, and particularly with regard to the problem of Namibia. On the human level, we have a people chafing under the yoke of a colonizer that employs arbitrary and inhuman principles and methods condemned by the entire international community. On the political level, the problem entails factors that threaten to lead to an even greater deterioration and even a conflagration throughout the Territory, if not beyond its borders.

107. Speaking on behalf of the people of Namibia, Mr. Nujoma was extremely positive; he reiterated and restated his position on the cease-fire in Namibia and his interest in co-operating with the Secretary-General; he lucidly expressed his agreement with the Secretary-General's position as reflected in the concluding observations in his report to the Council [*S/15776*]. The delegation of Egypt calls upon all the parties concerned to make a careful study of that positive position of SWAPO and to compare it with the statements made by the representative of the racist South African régime at the 2440th meeting and the continuous aggression being carried out by that régime against the people of Namibia, as well as against Mozambique, Angola, Lesotho and other countries in the region.

108. Indeed, no one can disregard or has the right to challenge the will of the international community as it was manifested at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held recently in Paris, in which 136 States participated together with several liberation movements and international bodies. In the Paris Declaration on Namibia,[2] the Conference expressed the resolve of the international community to support the independence of Namibia and the right of its struggling people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic and legitimate representative, to liberation and sovereignty over all their Territory.

109. The delegation of Egypt supports the observations contained in the report of the Secretary-General, especially those concerning resolution 435 (1978) and the fact that that resolution has yet to be implemented. We also feel that the new developments that have become a factor in the negotiations and which lie outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) place new impediments in the way of the people of Namibia and are a hindrance to their liberation from colonialism, which is the principal objec-

tive of the Council resolution. The Secretary-General frankly stated that the implementation of the resolution now appears to be conditional on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. We support the position of the Secretary-General in this connection and the concluding observations to his report.

110. In presenting its position on the problem of Namibia, the delegation of Egypt has been anxious to present the subject in the context of the position of non-alignment, the United Nations and international conferences, a position in which Egypt considers itself a party to the general consensus.

111. First of all, Egypt condemns the continued, illegitimate occupation of the Territory of Namibia, as well as South Africa's rejection and hindrance of a just solution to the problem.

112. Secondly, Egypt supports SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, in its just and legitimate struggle to achieve independence. We support the front-line States in their position on the problem and condemn all forms of aggression against those States by the racist régime of Pretoria.

113. Thirdly, Egypt calls for the full and immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), without any qualification or modification. We also call for the establishment of a time-frame. We use the term "time-frame" and not "deadline", but call for a reasonable time-frame for implementation of the aforementioned resolution, on condition that the Council be apprised of the full picture in order to adopt the actions it deems suitable. Egypt also calls upon the Council, in the face of the intransigence and defiance of the racist régime of South Africa, as embodied in the statement of its representative at the 2440th meeting, to condemn the continued illegitimate occupation of the Territory of Namibia and to condemn South Africa's defiance of the resolutions of the international Organization and to adopt the necessary effective measures provided for by the Charter of the United Nations.

114. Fourthly, in evaluating the efforts of the contact group, Egypt takes into account several factors—the most important of which is the time factor. We feel there is a need for speed in enabling the Namibian people to exercise their right to independence in their own Territory. Egypt also affirms that, from the practical standpoint, the delay in fully implementing resolution 435 (1978), simply enables South Africa to persist in its occupation and colonization of Namibia.

115. Fifthly, Egypt confirms that the problem of Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations in the first place and supports the statements of the Secretary-General in his report to the Council. Egypt also calls for continued action by the United Nations and the Secretary-General for it falls to them primarily to seek a just solution to the problem of Namibia.

116. In conclusion, on behalf of the African-Arab people of Egypt, I should like to express our hope that the current series of meetings of the Council will culminate in the achievement of our common goal: that of enabling the people of Namibia to exercise their legitimate right to freedom and independence so that Namibia may occupy its rightful place in the ranks of the international community.

117. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

118. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once more the Council is meeting to consider, at a high level, the difficult situation in southern Africa resulting from the Pretoria régime's persistence in impeding the Namibian people from regaining its usurped rights, notably those of freedom, independence and territorial integrity in accordance with Council resolution 435 (1978), which contained the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The Pretoria Fascist Government has frustrated all efforts to implement that plan by constantly raising issues totally unrelated to resolution 435 (1978). I refer in particular to Pretoria's malicious attempt to establish a link and to draw a parallel between the withdrawal of the Cuban forces at present legally stationed in Angola and the withdrawal from Namibia of the racist forces which occupy that country by sheer force of arms and use barbarous means to thwart the aspirations of the Namibian people. In his report [*ibid.*], the Secretary-General highlights the question of linkage, citing the conditions imposed by South Africa, which are outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) and of the final document of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March at New Delhi, which declared that "the Conference most categorically rejected the linkage or parallelism being drawn . . . between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola." [*S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I para. 48.*] The arguments of the *apartheid* régime, supported by the United States, are nothing more than an attempt to interfere in Angola's internal affairs, which we cannot accept. Indeed, the Council must demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from the Angolan territory they have occupied since South Africa's aggression against that country, which aspires to economic and social development.

119. My delegation considers it unnecessary to dwell on the details of the problem now under consideration. We fully support the position of the non-aligned countries on this issue as expressed by the Minister for External Affairs of India, who spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

120. From the mouths of the oppressed always comes the truth. The contact group no longer enjoys the confidence of SWAPO. Recently, we heard the Namibian militant, Mr. Nujoma, inform us that his organization believes that:

> "the role of the five Western Powers has ceased to be that of an honest broker in terms of the implementa-

tion of Council resolution 435 (1978). These Powers, and the Reagan Administration in particular, must be prevailed upon to desist forthwith from their sinister attempts to hijack and misuse the Namibian negotiating process in their own economic and strategic interests." [*2439th meeting, para. 146.*]

121. The Council cannot ignore this justified appeal, which, if it shows anything, shows deep disappointment, especially as the contact group had arrogated itself the task of mediation, acting within the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

122. The question before the Council must be dealt with on the basis that the Council is the organ responsible for ensuring the implementation of its resolutions in this case in particular, resolution 435 (1978). Any deviation from that objective would be considered a setback to the attainment of independence by Namibia. Therefore the Council must be guided by the decisions of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris during the last week of April, which was attended by representatives of 136 States and also representatives of national liberation movements and international organizations. In its evaluation of the situation in Namibia, the Conference expressed its alarm at the fact that the Council has so far been unable to fulfil its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security because of the opposition of the Western permanent members of the Council. The Conference considered that the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and their effective world-wide application was the only way of compelling South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations.

123. Therefore, there is a conviction within the international community that the racist régime in South Africa can only be made to respect resolution 435 (1978) and the peace plan if sanctions are imposed against it, since that is the only language that is understood by the racists, and the only practical means of compelling the racist régime to respect international law. If the Security Council failed for any reason whatsoever to adopt a resolution imposing mandatory sanctions against South Africa, it would mean that the *apartheid* régime would be free to commit any acts it wished and in Namibia and to escalate external aggression against Angola, Lesotho, Mozambique, Seychelles and Zimbabwe. It should be noted that the export of aggression to the neighbouring countries of South Africa is a way of blackmailing the international community and its victims alike with the aim of perpetuating the racist régime's occupation of Namibia and imposing further conditions to undermine the international legitimacy represented by resolution 435 (1978). We believe that if the countries of the contact group committed themselves to agreeing to the imposition of sanctions against South Africa this would prove their seriousness and give them credibility, particularly as they were the sponsors of the plan adopted by the Council. We know, however, that those States would not abide by such sanctions.

124. Occupation, tyranny and oppression such as the peoples of Namibia, South Africa and the neighbouring States are suffering are not unknown to us in the Middle East. Because of our own suffering and bitter experiences we can fully understand the suffering of the peoples of southern Africa. Because of the racist and arrogant nature of the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv—both of which have had long practice in selective settler colonization—it is impossible not to see not just the similarity but the complete identity of the terrorist practices of the two régimes. Both have usurped land by force and subjugated the indigenous population that owned it. Both have exploited natural and human resources out of self-interest. Both have put themselves in a classification above that of other human groups, which they have gone to the length of dividing these groups into categories and grades. In Africa, the racist minority claims that it selected to carry the message of the white man. In occupied Palestine, the racist Zionists claim that they carry out occupation, murder, the displacement of persons, usurpation and destruction sometimes because of a divine mission and sometimes in the name of the history which it has invented and formulated to justify its aggression against our Arab people. The Council listened to the statement [*2440th meeting*] of the representative of the white racist minority in South Africa. Did that statement not remind its members of the twisted logic exhibited by the representative of Israel in this Council? Is there not an alliance, co-operation and co-ordination in all fields between the two racist régimes—that of Tel Aviv and that of Pretoria? Is there not a similarity in the hatred of the innocent refugees who are pursued by the two régimes with their aircraft and armoured cars in order to destroy them in the countries of asylum?

125. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence condemned Israel and other Western countries for co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa in the economic, political, military and nuclear fields—co-operation which encourages Pretoria to challenge the international community. The Conference also strongly condemned the collusion of certain Western Governments, in particular the Governments of the United States and Israel, with the racist régime of South Africa, especially in the nuclear field. We draw attention to the fact that the so-called policy of constructive engagement adopted by the Administration of President Reagan falls within the same framework as the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel.

126. The Syrian Arab Republic, on the basis of its position of principle, believes in the unity of the Arab-African struggle against racist Zionism and *apartheid*, because the aims of the racist régimes are one and the same and their tactics are one and the same—that is, collusion and co-operation with the vicious forces that have a selfish interest in perpetuating exploitation, dependency and slavery.

127. The people of Namibia are suffering under the yoke of deprivation and slavery, and that tyranny has reached the point of preventing the exercise of all funda-

mental human rights. By coercion, some Namibians have been recruited to fight against their own people, and acts of murder, torture, forced evacuation, flogging, imprisonment and detention take place every day; in addition, there are the continuous attempts to separate Namibians from each other, keeping them in bantustans and sowing the seeds of enmity between them in order to foment civil war. All this is coupled with the plundering of the natural and mineral resources and the vicious exploitation of the workers, including women and children. Despite all that, there are those who put acts of self-defence on the same level as State and other forms of terrorism and describe heroic acts of resistance as terrorism, as if heroism in resitance were the monopoly of Europeans and other Westerners, something in which they take pride, while denouncing it when it is shown by the oppressed peoples of the third world.

128. I should like to quote the following statement made by the representative of SWAPO to the Council:

> "I wish to declare, in the name of the people of Namibia, that unless this august body acts decisively to secure the withdrawal of South Africa from the international Territory of Namibia, we shall have no alternative but to continue the armed struggle with greater intensity. We do not love bloodshed, but when we are dealing with a Government like that of South Africa, which believes in violence and bloodshed, we must be prepared to meet it on its own terms. Our struggle may be long and protracted; our struggle may be bloody and costly in terms of human life; it is a price we are prepared to pay for our independence." [*1588th meeting, para. 124.*]

129. The Syrian Arab Republic, its people and its Government, while declaring their full support for the struggle of the Namibian people under SWAPO, while confirming their intention to sustain that struggle by all means and while affirming their support for and solidarity with the front-line States in their historic struggle to ensure their independence and eradicate racism from southern Africa, know from historical precedents that defeat must be the fate of the aggressor and the exploiting colonialist. That is why we hope that the Council, if it wants to exercise its responsibility by putting an end to aggression, safeguarding the international order and maintaining world peace, will impose comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to compel it to abide by the will of the international community, because sanctions are the only and the ultimate means of solving the problem of Namibia peacefully. Otherwise there will be no solution but the continuation of the armed struggle by the Namibian masses under the leadership of SWAPO, which enjoys the support of all people who love peace and liberty. We are convinced that the final victory will be on the side of right and justice and the people struggling for freedom, independence and equal rights.

130. Before concluding, I should like to pay a tribute to the valuable efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Special Committee Against *Apartheid* to continue the struggle against racism, occupation and colonialism so that Namibia and all the peoples of southern Africa may enjoy full rights.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, Vol. I, annex II.

[2] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

[3] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1.*

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—March 1991—2,050